

REMARKS

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 10, 11, 13, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over US 6788980 to Johnson in view of WO 0227997 to McMullan. Claim 19 has been added herein.

Response to Rejections Under Section 112:

Applicant has amended claim 11 as supported at least by paragraph 18 of the originally filed specification to overcome the indefiniteness rejection. Applicant has added new claim 19 to further define the claimed invention, and that claim is also supported at least by paragraph 18 of the originally filed specification. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 USC 112 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Applicant notes that Examiner has interpreted transmission path as Applicant intended it to mean. Applicant appreciates Examiner's clarification of the term and explanation of actions. For sake of further clarity, Applicant has amended claim 10 to use terms more closely aligned with the terms in the written specification, paragraph 18.

In claim 10 Applicant claims "wherein the first firewall secures transmissions on the first data stream **but not on the second data stream**, and the second firewall secures transmissions on the second data stream **but not on the first data stream**." In contrast, McMullan indicates in several places throughout the specification that the communications that pass through the server firewall 120, and client firewall 124, 126, are bi-directional, and the data packets in both of the two data streams are both secured by the applicable firewall. In other words, both the server firewall 120, secures data packets in the first and second data stream, as does the client firewall 124, 126. That the communications are bidirectional is shown by the arrows depicting communications through these firewalls in figure 1 as bidirectional. That the firewalls secure data packets in the first and second data stream is evidenced by McMullan itself, which states: "As is common to many firewalls, server firewall 120 applies different, and much stricter, rules to data packets **coming into server 110 than to data packets emanating from server computer 110**." (Page 15, line 21 – page 16, line 1). (See also: Page 17, line 15; Page 18, ll. 13-15etc). If

the firewall is applying different rules to one data stream than to another, it must be applying rules to both data streams. Thus, Johnson as modified by McMullan does not teach or suggest Applicant's claim 10. Applicant respectfully requests the 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 10, and claims 11, 13, and 16-18, which depend from and include all the limitations of claim 10, based on Johnson as modified by McMullan, be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

April 28, 2009

By:

Janet D. Hood

Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830